



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,314	08/01/2006	Siew Kim Lee	DAIRY88.015APC	6941
20995	7590	10/20/2008	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			KRAUSE, ANDREW E	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR			4152	
IRVINE, CA 92614				

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/20/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/563,314	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANDREW KRAUSE	4152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/29/05</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Objections

1. **Claim 13** is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: "whey" is misspelled as "why". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1-3, 8-18, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ottenhof (EP 0 162 498).

3. Ottenhof discloses a process for preparing a dairy product without removing whey comprising:
 - a. providing a dairy starting material comprising casein and undenatured whey protein (p.1, lines 5-10);
 - b. adjusting the pH to a preselected point between 5-8 (p. 1, lines 5-10);
 - c. subjecting the material with the desired pH to a cooking step (p. 1, lines 9-11);
 - d. adjusting the pH of the cooked product to 4.5-7.5 (p. 1 line 12, line 25);
 - e. processing the pH 4.5-7.5 product to form the final product (p.8 lines 36-38)
4. Regarding claims 2 and 21, the product is a cheese or cheese like product (p.6 line 26-p.7 line 9, p. 7 lines 10-32).
5. Regarding claim 3, the dairy starting material is skim milk (p. 2 line 6), or a mixture of skim milk and whey protein (p. 2 line 7).
6. Regarding claims 9 and 10, the pH at the end of step (b) is 6.8 (p. 1 line 9).
7. Regarding claims 11-15, the acid or alkali is added after the cooking to achieve a pH of 5.4 (p. 4, line 14).
8. Regarding claim 16, heating the mixture to 60 °C or higher is disclosed (p. 4, line 35, p. 8, line 27).
9. Regarding claims 17 and 18, a cooking time of 15 minutes is disclosed (p. 8, line 27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. **Claims 4- 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottenhof as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Bisson (US #5,714,182).

15. Regarding claim 4, Ottenhof fails to disclose the ratio of whey to casein in the dairy starting material. However, Bisson discloses a similar method for producing a dairy product wherein the ratio of whey to casein is 30:70 (column 1, lines38-40).

16. Regarding claims 5-7, Ottenhof does not explicitly state the concentration of casein in the starting material. However, Bisson discloses casein concentrations in the starting dairy product of about 9.1.

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Ottenhof with the casein to whey ration and casein concentration disclosed by Bisson because adjusting these variables allows the manufacturer to alter the texture of final product (column 3, table 2).

18. Further, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

19. **Claim 19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottenhof in view of Hoermann (US #6,036,979).

20. Ottenhoff discloses a method for preparing a cheese product comprising providing a dairy material comprising whey and casein proteins, adjusting the pH, subjecting the material to a cooking step, and adjusting the pH of the cooked product (see above rejection to claim 1). Ottenhoff fails to disclose placing the pH 4.5-7.5 product into packaging while still liquid and providing conditions which allow the packaged product to set.

21. However, Hoermann discloses a method for producing a cheese product comprising adding the cheese product to containers while still liquid, and then providing conditions which allow the packaged product to set (Column 2, lines 1-12).

22. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

24. US 6365205 B1

25. US 6036979 A

26. EP 1946647 A1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW KRAUSE whose telephone number is (571)270-7094. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5, off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Del Sole can be reached on (571)272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ANDREW KRAUSE/
Examiner, Art Unit 4152

/Joseph S. Del Sole/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152